REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

In the Office Action, Claims 1-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C.§101. Claims 21-23 are treated as being withdrawn (non-elected) claims.

Claim 1 is amended to tie the claimed method to a particular apparatus, which support at least can be found in original Claim 13 and paragraphs [0040] and [0057] of this Specification. No new matter is added. Claims 21-23 are canceled and Applicant reserves the right to seek protection for these and previously canceled claims to be applied in another patent application. Currently, Claims 1-12 remain pending.

Reconsideration is respectfully requested based on the amended claims and following remarks.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §101

In the Office Action, Claims 1-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 as not falling within one of the four statutory category of invention. Specifically, the Office Action states that "independent claim 1 is directed to a video decoding method directed to a series of steps drawn for storing at least one previous product in a memory ..., determining which block to use as a prediction block ..., reading from the memory at least one previous product, ..., and calculating at least one quantized AC coefficient of the current block without any ties to a particular apparatus/structure." Claims 2-12 are rejected because Claims 2-12 depend from Claim 1.

In this Amendment, Claim 1 is amended to be tied to be implemented in a video decoding device. Under such amendment, it is clear that amended Claim 1 already excludes the scope of being performed manually without the use a particular machine. In other words, amended Claim 1 now defines a reasonable scope that complies with the spirit of In re Bilski, 88 USPQ2d 1385 (Fed. Cir. 2008).

Moreover, amended Claim 1 recites that "storing at least one previous product in a memory" and "calculating at least one quantized AC coefficient of the current block using the at least one previous product read from the memory." In other words, amended Claim 1 recites steps implemented in a video decoding device

that process video data having interaction with a memory device to obtain a tangible result of "a better calculation order of the current block, so related calculation loading and time while decoding the current block are decreased to improve the decoding efficiency." See paragraph [0058] of this Specification.

5   Applicant therefore respectfully submits that amended Claim 1 now falls within one of the four statutory categories of invention. Claims 2-12 depend from Claim 1 and thus also fall in one statutory category stipulated in 35 U.S.C.§101.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of 35 U.S.C.§101 rejections to Claims 1-12.

10

CONCLUSION

All of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore requests that the Examiner reconsiders all presently outstanding rejections and that they be withdrawn. Applicant believes that a full and complete reply has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition of allowance.

Prompt and favorable considerations of this Amendment and Reply is respectfully requested.

Sincerely yours,

_____/Winston Hsu/_____   Date: ____06/26/2009_____

Winston Hsu, Patent Agent No. 41,526

P.O. BOX 506, Merrifield, VA 22116, U.S.A.

Voice Mail: 302-729-1562

Facsimile: 806-498-6673

e-mail : winstonhsu@naipo.com

Note: Please leave a message in my voice mail if you need to talk to me. (The time in D.C. is 12 hours behind the Taiwan time, i.e. 9 AM in D.C. = 9 PM in Taiwan.)